

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-14 and 16 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution and raised by the Examiner in the previous Office Action; (c) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of finally-rejected claims; and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment was necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over “Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art” (AAPA), in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,502,279 to Bundschuh et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action contends that the Bundschuh patent “teaches a core mandrel 8 with a plurality of adapter sleeves 36 to provide mandrels with varying diameters.” This statement, however, is a mischaracterization of the Bundschuh patent. Bundschuh discloses an improved spindle for supporting and driving movie reels having center openings of different sizes. In particular, the Bundschuh structure specifically accommodates movie reels for two types of film and thus is suited for accommodating two inside diameter reels. Bundschuh describes a reel supporting adapter sleeve 36 that is slidably mounted on a reel supporting cylindrical post 8 and

is movable between an operative position (shown in Fig. 1) and an inoperative position (shown in Fig. 3). See column 2, lines 51-54. It is clear from this description that Bundschuch thus lacks the claimed core mandrel and plurality of adapter sleeves to provide mandrels with varying diameters.

In an effort to clarify this distinction, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that the adapter sleeves comprise varying exterior dimensions and are interchangeably engageable with the core mandrel. Nowhere does the Bundschuch patent remotely disclose or suggest interchangeable adapter sleeves having varying exterior dimensions. Rather, as noted, Bundschuch discloses a single adapter sleeve 36 that is slidable between an operative and an inoperative position, depending on the type of film supported on the spindle.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 is misplaced.

Moreover, with regard to claim 10, claim 10 recites that a thermal expansion rate of the adapter sleeves is lower than that of the core mandrel. In this context, the Office Action contends that “it is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to have used steel adapter sleeves.” Additionally, the Office Action contends that “it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.” Although Applicant may not necessarily disagree with these statements, neither statement serves to support the rejection of this subject matter. That is, neither the AAPA nor the Bundschuch patent discloses structure wherein a thermal expansion rate of an adapter sleeve is lower than that of a core mandrel. Indeed, in the Bundschuch patent, an expansion rate of the adapter sleeve and that of the post 8 are of no consequence since temperatures of a film reel do not affect the materials on which the

reels are supported. For this reason also, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 10 is misplaced.

With regard to dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11-14 and 16, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:           /Alan M. Kagen/            
          Alan M. Kagen  
          Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100